REMARKS

I.   INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 19, 29, 38 and 44 have been amended. Support for the amended limitations of independent claims 1, 19, 29, 38 and 44 can be found at least on page 10, lines 13-21 of the originally filed Specification. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. Claims 1-12 and 15-45 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II.   CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-12 and 15-45 stand objected to due to the fact that it is unclear whether the customer referred to in the claim limitation "a customer premises"[1] recited in claim 1 is the same customer as recited in the remainder of the claim. (See 10/14/09 Office Action, p. 5.) Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a premises of the customer," which the Applicants believe describes the subject matter of the claim in the clearest manner. Claims 19, 29, 38 and 44 have been amended in the same manner. In view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

III.   CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-12 and 15-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pub. App. No. 2002/0035493 to Mozayeny et al. (hereinafter "Mozayeny") in view of U.S. Pub.

---

[1] The Applicants note that the Examiner incorrectly stated that claim 1 recited the limitation of "a *customer's* premises," when in fact claim 1, as well as claims 19, 29, 38 and 44 recited "a *customer* premises." (See 10/14/09 Office Action, p. 5; 7/29/09 Amendment, pp. 2, 5, 8, 9, 11.) The Applicants believe that the same claim amendments are called for in either case, and will proceed accordingly.

App. No. 2001/0047264 to Roundtree (hereinafter "Roundtree") and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,178,443 to Lin (hereinafter "Lin"). (See 10/14/09 Office Action, pp. 2-20.)

Claim 1, as presently amended, recites, in relevant part, "accessing a profile for the customer from a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer, the preferences being previously obtained through at least one of the following: previous verbal communication with the customer, data message transaction with the customer, and tracking previous scheduling requests made by the customer."

The examiner concedes that Mozayeny and Roundtree do not disclose "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained at a customer premises," as recited in claim 1 prior to the present amendment. (See 10/14/09 Office Action, p. 5.) Addressing this deficiency, the Examiner cites Lin, asserting that "Lin discloses accessing a profile for a customer from a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained at the customer's premises ("retrieve user preference information for the current user from local user preference file 4", col. 5, lines 1-6)." (Id., p. 5, citing Lin, col. 5, ll. 1-6.) The Examiner further asserts that "[i]t would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored and accessed a customer's profile locally a (sic) the customer premises in case a profile at server side cannot be accessed (see Lin col. 5, lines 1-6)." (10/14/09 Office Action, p. 5, citing Lin, col. 5, ll. 1-6.)

Lin discloses methods and systems for propagating user preference information among a plurality of computing environments. (See Lin, Abstract.) A user preferences database 2 is stored at a repository computer 1. (See id., col. 2, ll. 11-13; Fig. 1.) One or more local computers 3 store local user preference files 4. (See id., col. 2, ll. 25-26; Fig. 1.) The user preferences database 2 and the local user preference files 4 store user-specific preference information. (See id., col. 2, ll. 26-28.) The local computers 3 also store client-side synchronization agents 7, which are responsible for maintenance and use of user preference information. (See id., col. 3, ll. 5-7; Fig. 1.) Communications links 5 connect the repository

14

computer 1 to the local computers 3. (See id., col. 2, ll. 34-36; Fig. 1.) When a user logs into one of the local computers 3 and is verified, the client-side synchronization agent 7 attempts to retrieve current user preference information from the repository computer 1, and, if successful, implements those user preferences in the local computer 3. (See id., col. 4, ll. 60-63; Fig. 3.) If retrieval of user preference information from the repository computer 1 is unsuccessful, which might occur because no information exists in the user preferences database 2 or because of a failure of the communications link 5, the client-side synchronization agent 7 may retrieve user preference information from the local user preference file 4 and implement those preferences in the local computer 3. (See id., col. 5, ll. 1-8; Fig. 3.) Thus, as the Examiner points out, the user preferences database 2 and the local user preference files 4 provide redundant storage of user preferences.

In contrast, claim 1, as presently amended, recites "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained *only* at a premises of the customer." Lin discloses no embodiments in which user preferences are stored only at the local computers 3, and not also at the repository computer 1. (See Lin, *passim.*) Further, Lin suggests no such embodiment. Rather, the central purpose of Lin is to provide centralized storage of user preferences and synchronize those preferences with local computers. (See id., Abstract.) As the Examiner correctly points out, a further benefit of Lin is to provide redundant storage at both the repository computer 1 and the local computer 3 in the event that the two cannot communicate with one another. (See 10/14/09 Office Action, p. 5, citing Lin, col. 5, ll. 1-6.) Therefore, one of skill in the art would have no motivation to modify Lin to obtain an embodiment wherein the user preferences were stored only at the local computer 3.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lin does not cure the admitted deficiencies of Mozayeny and Roundtree, and that Mozayeny, Roundtree and Lin, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-12 and 15-18 depend from, and, therefore,

include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 19, as presently amended, recites, in relevant part, "accessing a profile database, the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer, to search for preferences containing information omitted in the request data, the preferences being previously obtained through at least one of the following: previous verbal communication with the customer, data message transaction with the customer, and tracking previous scheduling requests made by the customer." The Applicants respectfully submit that Mozayeny, Roundtree and Lin, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer," as recited in claim 19, for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 20-28 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 19, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 29, as presently amended, recites, in relevant part, "a profile database containing preference data comprising information omitted in the scheduling request data, the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer, the preference data being previously obtained through at least one of the following: previous verbal communication with the customer, data message transaction with the customer, and tracking previous scheduling requests made by the customer, the preference data being used to update the scheduling request data, when the scheduling request data omits the information contained in the preference data, without requiring further customer interaction." The Applicants respectfully submit that Mozayeny, Roundtree and Lin, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer," as recited in claim 29, for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 30-37 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 29, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 38, as presently amended, recites, in relevant part, "a profile database containing preference data comprising information omitted in the request data, the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer, the preference data being previously obtained through at least one of the following: previous verbal communication with the customer, data message transaction with the customer, and tracking previous scheduling requests made by the customer, the preference data being used to update the request data, when the request data omits the information contained in the preference data, without requiring further customer interaction." The Applicants respectfully submit that Mozayeny, Roundtree and Lin, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer," as recited in claim 38, for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 39-43 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 38, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 44, as presently amended, recites, in relevant part, "accessing a profile for the customer form a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer, the preferences being previously obtained through at least one of the following: previous verbal communication with the customer, data message transaction wit the customer, and tracking previous scheduling requests made by the customer." The Applicants respectfully submit that Mozayeny, Roundtree and Lin, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "the profile database comprising a profile database storage maintained only at a premises of the customer," as recited in claim 44, for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claim 45 depends from, and, therefore, includes all of the limitations of claim 44, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 14, 2010

By: _____
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276

18